- 1 yours, so you find that the licensee is operating in a way
- that, in your judgement, considering what the rules require
- 3 and what the policy statements might add to the rules, do
- 4 you then inform the licensee that he is not doing what you
- 5 would have done in your judgement?
- 6 A That would be one of the avenues, yes.
- 7 Q Do you not do that?
- 8 A On occasion, yes.
- 9 Q Do you do it every time you find a situation where
- 10 your judgement of what is required differs from the
- 11 licensee's judgement of what is required?
- 12 A It depends on the nature of the inspection and why
- the inspection was being made to begin with.
- 14 Q You have indicated to me in my role as counsel for
- Monticello Mountaintop, that you have inspected other
- broadcast stations that have telephone dial up, remote
- 17 control systems?
- 18 A Correct.
- 19 Q I think you indicated that it was fewer than ten
- 20 FM stations that operated that way?
- 21 A Yes.
- 22 Q How many AM stations would you say?
- 23 A I don't recall specifically. I'm sure it was a
- very small number similar to ten.
- Q Did you tell me that when you found that they had

- 1 such systems, that you wrote them notices of violation?
- 2 A I either wrote it specifically or I said something
- 3 in person when I was there.
- 4 Q That they were in violation?
- 5 A That things could be improved, yes.
- 6 O There's a difference.
- 7 A Well, in the opinion, I probably presented it as
- 8 such in the opinion of the inspecting engineer, this is not
- 9 a reliable system.
- 10 Q When you say that, are you saying this is in the
- 11 opinion of Serge Loginow?
- 12 A Yes, of the inspecting engineer.
- 13 Q You're not expressing as the voice of the FCC,
- then, that in the judgement of Federal Communications
- 15 Commission, a telephone dial up remote control system is not
- 16 reliable, are you?
- 17 A I'm taking the best information, the rules and the
- 18 clarifications and applying it to the certain instance that
- 19 I have before me and making a decision at the time.
- MR. RILEY: Your Honor, I would like to refer Mr.
- 21 Loginow to his deposition again, page 117.
- 22 JUDGE STEINBERG: Is there a conflict in there?
- 23 MR. RILEY: Yes, I think there is, Your Honor.
- JUDGE STEINBERG: What was the page again?
- MR. RILEY: Page 117, Your Honor, line 24. At the

- very bottom, Mr. Loginow.
- 2 BY MR. RILEY:
- 3 Q Do you see where we are?
- 4 A "That our right notice is --"
  - 5 MR. ARONOWITZ: Your Honor --
- 6 MR. RILEY: I haven't asked a question yet. I'm
- 7 referring him to where we are on this. If you're with me,
- 8 Mr. Loginow.
- 9 BY MR. RILEY:
- 10 Q Just above line 24, I asked you to look at another
- document that you had prepared and the question to you was
- 12 essentially this. Does that document indicate that few or
- very few, less than ten, of the stations you had inspected,
- 14 had telephone remote control? Do you see that, I asked you
- and you said yes, you did. We're down at the bottom of page
- 16 117.
- 17 A Yes, go ahead.
- 18 Q Now, talking about that universe of less than ten,
- and I said, did you write notices of violations to those
- 20 stations, and you, at the top of 118, said, "Yes, I did."
- 21 Isn't that your answer, "Yes, I did."
- 22 A And I clarified it in the next response.
- Q Okay, you said, "Either I note violation notices
- or I mentioned it to them, that this is an unreliable form
- of remote control." Now, do you know whether you wrote any

1	of	those	stations	violation	notices	for	this	point?

- 2 MR. ARONOWITZ: Objection, Your Honor. I want to
- make an objection as to the relevancy of what he did with
- 4 the other stations. In fact, in this very same deposition,
- 5 he has testimony that goes, that further clarifies this.
- 6 Not only is what was done at the other stations not
- 7 relevant, it's assuming a fact in evidence, and that is that
- 8 he would always write, or in these type of situations, he
- 9 would always write a notice of violation, and that has been
- 10 addressed.
- MR. RILEY: May I respond, Your Honor?
- JUDGE STEINBERG: Yes.
- MR. RILEY: What I'm really pursuing here is two
- 14 things. One, the credibility of the witness, his
- forthrightness and candor, both in dealing with the Mass
- Media Bureau and with Monticello Mountaintop and the
- 17 reliability of his judgement about what he saw up there in
- 18 Ferndale that day. I think I'm entitled to pursue it.
- JUDGE STEINBERG: One last word.
- MR. ARONOWITZ: But, it still assumes a fact in
- 21 evidence, and that being that every time he would find this
- 22 type of violation, he would write a notice of violation or
- 23 any time he would find something that conflicted, he would
- 24 write a notice.
- JUDGE STEINBERG: The objection is overruled. Mr.

- 1 Loginow's testimony, as clarified, was sometimes he'd write
- a notice and sometimes he'd tell them verbally that, in his
- opinion, this remote control system was not reliable.
- The question I have is, and Mr. Riley might want
- 5 to cover it later and he might not, when Mr. Turro told you
- 6 that the Monticello transmitter was using a telephone dial
- 7 up remote control system, did you give Mr. Turro your
- 8 opinion that that system was unreliable?
- 9 THE WITNESS: At that time, no. No, I did not.
- JUDGE STEINBERG: Why not?
- THE WITNESS: I didn't want to get into a
- 12 discussion whether it was a reliable remote control unit at
- 13 that time or not.
- 14 JUDGE STEINBERG: During the course of your
- inspections and you run into the telephone dial up remote
- 16 control systems, do you always mention it to the licensee or
- 17 did you?
- 18 THE WITNESS: Right, well, I consider the
- 19 appropriate place to respond to the whole inspection is at
- the end. In other words, when a licensee presents a
- 21 document, a piece of information, piece of equipment, a
- 22 procedure, anything. I let that stand, you know, I make a
- 23 notation or a mental notation and then I respond to it later
- 24 in a summation.
- The fact that Mr. Turro said it was a dial up

- didn't help me to respond to seeking remote control in
- 2 Ferndale, since he was not located in Ferndale at the time
- 3 he was telling me this. So, I had to rely upon the
- 4 personnel of WXTM, rather WJUX, in Ferndale --
- JUDGE STEINBERG: That was out in Dumont, New
- 6 Jersey?
- 7 THE WITNESS: Correct, to convey that information
- 8 to me and to demonstrate that to me.
- 9 JUDGE STEINBERG: But, they didn't do that?
- 10 THE WITNESS: No, they didn't.
- JUDGE STEINBERG: At no time did they do that?
- 12 THE WITNESS: At no time did they do that. And,
- when I asked Mr. Blabey about remote control, he said there
- 14 was none. So, that's the only thing I could go by. There
- was no remote control in Ferndale.
- JUDGE STEINBERG: During a typical inspection of
- an FM broadcast station, you go in there, you do your thing
- and then you write it up and then, if there are violations,
- 19 you send out an official notice of violation, is that
- 20 correct?
- 21 THE WITNESS: Yes.
- JUDGE STEINBERG: Or, somebody from Washington
- 23 does? Or, how does it work?
- 24 THE WITNESS: Well, it depends how we got there in
- 25 the first place. If it's a random inspection done to garner

- 1 numbers, we, ourselves, generate the violation notice.
- JUDGE STEINBERG: But, if it's an inspection
- 3 requested by someone here in Washington, is the procedure
- 4 different?
- 5 THE WITNESS: Yeah, normally, we just determine
- 6 the information and pass it on.
- JUDGE STEINBERG: Pass it on to the people in
- 8 Washington?
- 9 THE WITNESS: Yes, the group that requested it.
- JUDGE STEINBERG: So, to that extent, this
- 11 particular investigation of the translators in WJUX is
- 12 perfectly typical?
- 13 THE WITNESS: Typical of a request, yeah, made out
- 14 of Washington.
- JUDGE STEINBERG: Nothing unusual about it?
- 16 THE WITNESS: No, not at all.
- 17 MR. RILEY: Your Honor, I will come back to that
- last point momentarily, but I want to pursue this a little
- 19 bit with Mr. Loginow.
- 20 BY MR. RILEY:
- 21 Q Mr. Loginow, did you speak with Mr. Blabey before
- about the subject of whether it was remote control, before
- 23 Mr. Turro's call came? You did, did you not?
- 24 A I had begun speaking with him, yes.
- Q Had you asked him the question of whether there

- was a remote control unit there before you spoke to Mr.
- 2 Turro on the phone?
- A I don't recall whether I had a chance to ask him
- 4 about remote control then or not.
- 5 Q Now, when you spoke with Mr. Turro on the phone
- and he told you there was a dial up remote control, I
- 7 understand your answers to Judge Steinberg to be that you
- 8 didn't pursue this with Mr. Turro at all, is that right?
- 9 A That's correct.
- 10 Q Since you have a copy of this 1988 public notice
- there in front of you, when did you familiarize yourself
- 12 with this 1988 public notice?
- 13 A The public notice itself is recent, but we
- understood the concept of it, you know, for a few years.
- 15 Q Is the we you?
- 16 A I'm sorry, yes. I understood the concept of it.
- 17 Q When did you first see it?
- 18 A I first saw this last night.
- 19 Q That's what I thought.
- JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay, you first saw this,
- 21 meaning the text of the public notice.
- 22 MR. RILEY: The 1988 --
- THE WITNESS: Yes, meaning the public notice, yes.
- MR. RILEY: The 1988 public notice, Your Honor,
- that you had cited into the record as September 12, 1988.

- 1 The notice is headlined Clarification of Commission Rules
- 2 Pertaining to Broadcast Station Transfer of Remote Control
- 3 Operation.
- 4 BY MR. RILEY:
- 5 Q That's the one you're looking at, isn't it, sir?
- 6 A Yes, yes.
- 7 Q Do you conclude, having reviewed this last night,
- 8 that by this clarification, the Commission was making clear
- 9 that telephone dial up remote control, using the public
- switch network, was permissible provided certain guidelines
- 11 were followed?
- 12 A Yes.
- 13 Q Now, having seen this last night for the first
- 14 time and not prior to your inspection at Ferndale, how could
- you have concluded that the dial up remote control for WJUX
- 16 did not meet these conditions?
- 17 A I understood the concept of the guidelines herein
- 18 without actually observing the public notice, because field
- 19 engineers, you know, field offices get information by other
- 20 means, other than having to read the public notice.
- 21 Q Then, let me ask you another question. If you
- 22 understood these points, what was there about any conditions
- 23 that had to exist that you could not have determined by
- 24 questioning Mr. Turro over the telephone?
- 25 A I --

Τ.	MR. ARONOWITZ: Objection. Mr. Loginow answered
2	that he did not ask Mr. Turro these questions because he was
3	not at
4	MR. RILEY: No, that's not his answer and if he's
5	going to state an objection, that was neither the question
6	nor the answer, because Mr. Loginow didn't he said he
7	couldn't have determined it from Mr. Turro, because Mr.
8	Turro was somewhere at a remote point talking to him. That
9	was his answer.
10	My question to him is simple. What of these could
11	not have been determined from Mr. Turro over the telephone?
12	MR. ARONOWITZ: He did not say he did not
13	MR. RILEY: Yes, he did.
14	MR. ARONOWITZ: I think he said he chose not
15	JUDGE STEINBERG: Well, let me sustain the
16	objection because I don't remember what Mr. Loginow said
17	frankly, on this point, except that he did not inform Mr.
18	Turro that, in his judgement, the system was not in
19	compliance, and let Mr. Riley lay the foundation and then
20	ask a question, because I forgot what the answer was.
21	MR. RILEY: I will pick up at that point.
22	BY MR. RILEY:
23	Q Mr. Loginow, it is true that the entire substance
24	of your discussion with Mr. Turro about telephone dial up

remote control for WJUX and Ferndale was limited to Mr.

25

- 1 Turro telling you that there was a telephone dial up remote
- 2 control system for WJUX, is that right?
- 3 A That's correct.
- Q Did you not pursue that with Mr. Turro because you
- 5 chose not to?
- 6 A The implication, see, that statement arose out of
- 7 result of asking about the remote control for WJUX, and Mr.
- 8 Turro stated there was no remote control. All remote
- 9 control is done out of Dumont, New Jersey, the Dumont
- 10 studios.
- So, he is establishing the fact that the primary
- remote is done from Dumont, and this further stated that
- there were meter readings, etc., taken out at Dumont.
- JUDGE STEINBERG: You can do it at Dumont, though,
- if you have a dedicated line?
- THE WITNESS: Right. But, he's not using the dial
- 17 up circuit. It's a dedicated remote control unit, a higher
- 18 level of remote control.
- 19 MR. RILEY: That is entirely true, but he's not
- 20 responding to my question.
- 21 BY MR. RILEY:
- Q My question, Mr. Loginow, to you was, you did not
- 23 pursue with Mr. Turro a discussion of what he told you, the
- 24 telephone dial up remote control system, because you chose
- 25 not to, is that so?

1	A	Becai	ıse	it wa	as p	resented	as a	seco	ondary	means	of
2	remote	control	and	not	the	primary	means	s of	remote	conti	col.

- Now you're explaining why you chose not to, is
- 4 that correct?
- 5 A Yes, plus the fact that he was located at a remote
- 6 distance.
- 7 Q That's what I thought. Didn't you also, if this
- 8 was not your sole reason for not pursuing it with Mr. Turro
- on the telephone, is it not true that one of your reasons
- 10 for not pursuing it with him was that he wasn't present
- there in Ferndale, he was talking to you on the telephone?
- 12 A That's correct. I'm testing the remote control
- 13 capability of Ferndale.
- 14 Q And, he was on the telephone with you, not in
- 15 Ferndale, isn't that right?
- 16 A That's correct.
- 17 Q Now we're where I wanted to be. Will you look at
- this 1988 policy statement, the one released September 12,
- 19 1988 and tell me what conditions need to be met to allow you
- 20 some telephone dial up remote control in the public switch
- 21 network, that you could not determine by inquiring of Mr.
- 22 Turro on the telephone?
- 23 A I didn't have to determine by asking Mr. Turro,
- because it was already stated to me upon my arrival at WJUX.
- JUDGE STEINBERG: By Mr. Blabey?

1	THE WITNESS: Correct.
2	BY MR. RILEY:
3	Q Prior to your talking with Mr. Turro on the phone?
4	A Well, in addition, I already asked the question,
5	is there any dedicated telephone lines for WJUX coming into
6	the building and the answer I received was no, there is no
7	dedicated telephone lines coming in for WJUX.
8	JUDGE STEINBERG: Do you remember using the word
9	dedicated in your question?
10	THE WITNESS: Quite certain, yes.
11	MR. RILEY: Your Honor, let me just proceed a tad
12	further here.
13	BY MR. RILEY:
14	Q You do not understand this policy as requiring a
15	dedicated, single purpose remote control line to run between
16	Ferndale and the WJUX transmitter in order to make telephone
17	dial up remote control through the public network
18	permissible, do you?
19	A No, not a dedicated line, but a dedicated
20	telephone unit that no other line no one else can access
21	that line. In other words, when the operator has to dial up
22	the transmitter, he has to be able to do it, and not have
23	other activity, other telephone activity, on there.
24	JUDGE STEINBERG: Earlier, Mr. Riley gave an
25	example of having a telephone and calling his wife and while

- 1 he's calling his wife, then that telephone is not remote
- 2 control equipment.
- 3 THE WITNESS: Right.
- JUDGE STEINBERG: But, when he hangs up and then
- 5 picks up the receiver again and dials all the codes and
- 6 everything, then it is remote control equipment.
- 7 THE WITNESS: Okay.
- 8 JUDGE STEINBERG: So, your previous answer was
- 9 that your interpretation of the public notice is that to be
- in compliance with the policy of public notice, that phone
- would not be available for any other use other than the dial
- 12 up?
- THE WITNESS: Not necessarily for any other use,
- but it should be capable for use by the person responsible,
- 15 by the operator on duty.
- 16 JUDGE STEINBERG: Well, what other uses,
- 17 permissible uses could there be?
- 18 THE WITNESS: Well, the operator on duty could
- 19 call up anybody he wishes to, as long as he has control of
- the telephone.
- JUDGE STEINBERG: So, if Mr. Riley was the
- operator and he had that one telephone and he's calling his
- wife up and talking to his wife and he's got exclusive
- control over that phone and if he wants to, he can say,
- sorry, honey, I've got to adjust the transmitter, hang up.

- 1 Then, even while he's on the phone with his wife, then
- that's, in your opinion, considered remote control
- 3 equipment?
- 4 THE WITNESS: If he's actively controlling the
- 5 transmitter, then that is definitely remote control
- 6 equipment.
- JUDGE STEINBERG: But, still, while he's talking
- 8 to his wife, it's not remote control?
- 9 THE WITNESS: Semantics. In my estimation, it's
- 10 not.
- 11 JUDGE STEINBERG: Yes, it seems like a lot of
- 12 semantics.
- 13 MR. RILEY: I think it is, Your Honor, and that's
- one of the things that troubles me about this whole area,
- but I have to pursue it with Mr. Loginow, since the Bureau
- maintains as a point of violation that there wasn't remote
- 17 control and Mr. Loginow has conceded that he has been told
- that there was, and it now seems to be a judgmental dispute.
- 19 BY MR. RILEY:
- Q Mr. Loginow, to try to narrow --
- JUDGE STEINBERG: You're also going to establish
- through Mr. Weis, the licensee, I presume, his opinion on
- 23 all this?
- MR. RILEY: Oh, absolutely, Your Honor. He's
- 25 already stated that he believes that there was a telephone,

- there was a remote control unit there in his judgement that
- 2 satisfies the Commission's rules.
- We're now down to a very narrow range of what I
- 4 will argue later, of course, is a matter of personal taste
- 5 and judgement.
- BY MR. RILEY:
- 7 Q But, Mr. Loginow, again, look at the 1988 policy
- 8 statement that we all are looking at here, the
- 9 clarification. Where in this statement do you find anything
- 10 that says that the telephone instrument, the instrument
- 11 sitting on my desk, if I'm at my desk, must be exclusively
- 12 for use in dial up remote control?
- 13 A Isn't it in 4A on this public notice?
- 14 Q Well, doesn't that talk about a circuit, not a
- 15 telephone instrument?
- 16 A Correct.
- 17 Q Now, there's a difference, isn't there? The
- 18 circuit --
- 19 A Yes, that's correct.
- 20 MR. RILEY: I think that's the end of it, Your
- 21 Honor.
- BY MR. RILEY:
- Q Well, so you agree this doesn't say that you must
- have a telephone instrument solely dedicated to remotely
- 25 control --

- 1 MR. ARONOWITZ: Objection. He never said that.
- 2 MR. RILEY: He did.
- MR. ARONOWITZ: He said it was one of the
- 4 conditions under numbers of conditions. The question was
- 5 phrased in terms of a dedicated line for the exclusive use.
- 6 MR. RILEY: My question was --
- JUDGE STEINBERG: It's sustained, of course. The
- 8 question was, point to something in the public notice which
- 9 says you have to have a dedicated line or an instrument --
- 10 MR. RILEY: An instrument.
- JUDGE STEINBERG: An instrument. Mr. Loginow
- pointed to 4A and then Mr. Riley clarified.
- MR. RILEY: And, Mr. Loginow, I think, agreed that
- 14 it's talking about a circuit there, a telephone circuit,
- 15 which is what you --
- 16 THE WITNESS: Yes.
- MR. RILEY: -- access when you dial a number.
- JUDGE STEINBERG: Well, define a circuit, Mr.
- 19 Loginow, so that's in the record.
- THE WITNESS: Well, a circuit is a telephone line
- 21 with a separate number.
- JUDGE STEINBERG: In the switching building? It's
- 23 not the phone that Mr. Riley picks up and talks to his wife
- 24 on?
- THE WITNESS: Well, it could be that.

- 1 MR. RILEY: That phone is one of many, as many as
- there are, that can access the circuit that 4A is talking
- 3 about.
- 4 BY MR. RILEY:
- 5 O Is that not so?
- 6 A That's correct.
- 7 MR. RILEY: Mr. Aronowitz' objections, Your Honor,
- 8 are stymieing a lot of cross, because Mr. Aronowitz is
- 9 disputing what the witness has given has answers and he's
- 10 not stating legal objections.
- Now, I think the witness and I are in agreement on
- what his testimony is about this.
- 13 BY MR. RILEY:
- 14 Q Now, you did not ask Mr. Turro whether there was a
- 15 circuit for this telephone dial up remote control that was a
- 16 circuit used only to access the telephone dial up remote
- 17 control equipment? You did not ask him that. Why did you
- 18 not ask him that?
- 19 A I was, in effect, testing the personnel in
- 20 Ferndale, New York, where the main studio is supposedly
- located. I was not testing Mr. Turro, because he's
- 22 associated with the Dumont studio.
- 23 Q Let me ask you whether you ever discussed with Mr.
- 24 Blabey the presence of telephone dial up remote control for
- 25 controlling WJUX?

- 1 A No, sir, I did not. He never brought it up.
- MR. RILEY: Your Honor, I think I'm going to
- 3 switch subjects here.
- 4 BY MR. RILEY:
- 5 Q Mr. Blabey didn't bring it up, but you did not
- 6 bring it up either, did you?
- 7 A It was not my position to bring it up to him.
- 8 He's the one in the Ferndale studio. Upon my question if
- 9 there is a remote control, it was his opportunity to say we
- 10 have dial up remote control available, but he did not.
- 11 Q So, your report to the Mass Media Bureau of your
- 12 April inspection, which states that, you've looked at this
- before, there is no remote control equipment installed at
- 14 the main studio to control the WXTM transmitter or to read
- transmitter operating parameters, is a report to the Mass
- Media Bureau that entirely omits discussion of telephone
- 17 dial up remote control, is it not?
- 18 A That's correct.
- 19 Q To justify omitting that, you state that in your
- 20 judgement, conditions did not exist to find it viable at
- 21 this site, isn't that so?
- 22 A Correct.
- 23 Q You did not ask Mr. Turro or Mr. Blabey anything
- 24 about the conditions that would have justified it, isn't
- 25 that true?

- 1 A I asked Mr. Blabey about remote control.
- 2 O You asked --
- 3 A He could have presented his full knowledge and
- 4 extent about remote control available to the studios. And,
- 5 he said there was none.
- 6 Q Since you are here as a field inspector for the
- 7 FCC, and some weight will be given to your testimony arises
- 8 out of your experience in this field, is it your customary
- 9 practice to check stations that you're inspecting, either
- 10 because of a complaint alleging no remote control or
- inspecting on your general checklist which you do
- periodically, to examine them for remote control capability?
- 13 A Yes, that is among the things to check for.
- 14 Q Do you not ordinarily ask the persons you are
- 15 questioning whether they have satisfactory remote control
- 16 systems?
- 17 A Yes.
- 18 Q Now, Mr. Turro identified himself to you as the
- 19 chief operator in April of 1995, when you were on the phone,
- 20 did he not?
- 21 A That's correct.
- Q Ordinarily, the chief operator is somebody you
- would ask questions of that nature to, is it not?
- 24 A Ordinarily, yes.
- JUDGE STEINBERG: Are you going to switch subjects

- 1 now?
- 2 MR. RILEY: I think so, Your Honor.
- JUDGE STEINBERG: Let's take five minutes. Off
- 4 the record.
- 5 (Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)
- JUDGE STEINBERG: Back on the record. Mr. Riley,
- 7 why don't you continue?
- 8 MR. RILEY: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 9 BY MR. RILEY:
- 10 Q Mr. Loginow, one of the conclusions that you
- 11 reached in your April, 1995 inspection of the Ferndale
- installation of WJUX FM and rather than going back and
- forth, I'm going to call it WJUX, even though it's call sign
- 14 at that moment was WXTM.
- 15 A Okay.
- 16 Q There won't be any confusion, will there, between
- 17 us, when I say --
- 18 A No.
- 19 Q According to the Radio Station Inspection Report
- 20 which, I'm trying to find it here --
- JUDGE STEINBERG: That was page 254 of Bureau
- 22 Exhibit 16.
- MR. RILEY: Okay.
- BY MR. RILEY:
- Q According to that report, one of the conclusions

- that you reached was that, and I'll refer you to page 254
- 2 itself, the first page of the Radio Station Inspection
- Report, under the heading WXTM Main Studio Programming, one
- 4 of the conclusions you reached was that in order to use the
- 5 WJUX main studio to originate the programming for broadcast
- 6 by the WJUX transmitter, and if you'll look about four lines
- 7 under the heading I referred you to, that would require one
- 8 going to the transmitter site and affecting a change of
- 9 cabling at the patch panel to connect the transmitter in the
- 10 studio, do you see that?
- 11 A Yes.
- 12 Q Now, you reached that conclusion because of what
- you indicated in this report Mr. Blabey told you, is that
- 14 correct?
- 15 A That's correct.
- 16 Q Now, you later went to that transmitter site with
- 17 Mr. Blabey, did you not?
- 18 A Yes, I did.
- 19 Q While there, you did not ask Mr. Blabey to show
- you this patch panel in which the cabling had to be changed,
- 21 did you?
- 22 A No, I did not.
- 23 Q If you had asked him that at the transmitter site,
- 24 and he had changed the cabling at the patch panel -- you're
- now up on a mountain 15 minutes from the studio, is that

- 1 right?
- 2 A That's correct.
- 3 Q You're up at the WJUX transmitter?
- 4 A Right.
- 5 Q He had changed the cabling at the patch panel,
- then when you returned to Ferndale with Mr. Blabey, it's
- your understanding you could then have originated
- 8 programming from that main studio, is that correct?
- 9 A That's my understanding, yes.
- 10 Q That's what you reported to the Mass Media Bureau,
- 11 is it not?
- 12 A Yes, it is.
- 13 Q Now, you were in the main studio of WJUX? When I
- 14 say main studio, I mean the studio, the room from which WJUX
- would have originated programming in Ferndale, had it been
- 16 doing so at that time.
- 17 A Okay.
- 18 Q You were in that room, were you not?
- 19 A Very briefly.
- 20 Q But, you saw equipment in that room, did you not?
- 21 A Or, a lack of it.
- 22 Q Well, did you see a control board in there?
- A A control board, yes.
- 24 Q That's typical of what you'd see in a broadcast
- 25 studio from which programming would originate, is it not?

- 1 A Yes, it is.
- 2 Q Did you see a microphone in there?
- 3 A Yes.
- 4 Q Did you see some tape machines?
- 5 A Yes.
- Q Did you examine the wiring to see if the
- 7 microphone and the tape machines were connected to the
- 8 control panel?
- 9 A No, I did not.
- 10 Q So, you have no reason to think they were not, did
- 11 you?
- 12 A No, not at all.
- 13 Q But for Mr. Blabey telling you that, as you
- 14 understood it, the visit to the WJUX transmitter site some
- 15 couple of minutes, perhaps 15 minute drive away -- you've
- taken the drive. Am I right in saying about 15 minutes?
- 17 A Yes, it's about 15.
- 18 Q But for Mr. Blabey telling you that, you have no
- 19 reason other than that to believe that this studio could not
- 20 be appropriately considered to be a source capable as a main
- 21 studio must be, of putting programming directly on the air.
- 22 Am I right in that?
- A Yes, you're right.
- Q Can you tell me why, when you were up there at
- 25 that site with Mr. Blabey where the WJUX transmitter is, you

- did not ask him to show you this cabling patch panel that
- you understood him to say had to be changed in order to
- 3 originate from that site?
- A We had no reason to say it. I didn't doubt him
- 5 that there could be such a patch panel.
- JUDGE STEINBERG: A patch panel is just a bunch of
- 7 places where you can plug and unplug wires and make
- 8 different connections?
- 9 THE WITNESS: That's correct.
- 10 BY MR. RILEY:
- 11 Q Have you ever cited, if you recall, have you ever
- 12 cited as a violation of the main studio rule a situation
- where a station had a room fully equipped, so far as you
- 14 knew, to originate programming, but had to leave the
- building and go to a transmitter site some distance away, in
- this case, 15 minutes away, and affect a physical change at
- 17 that site to go on the air. Have you ever cited that, the
- 18 cause of that, as a violation of the main studio rule?
- 19 A We've never had that situation arise in 22 years,
- 20 where someone had to go to the transmitter to start
- 21 programming from their main studio. Never in 22 years.
- Q You found that unusual?
- 23 A Highly unusual.
- 24 O You considered that to be a violation?
- 25 A Oh, most definitely. Oh, most definitely.